

REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed August 23, 2007 (hereinafter "Office Action") and offer the following remarks to accompany the above amendments.

Initially, the Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 10-14 and 26-30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As will be detailed below, claims 1 and 17, the base claims from which claims 10-14 and 26-30 ultimately depend, are patentable over the cited references. Therefore, the Applicants will refrain from amending claims 10-14 and 26-30 at this time. Nevertheless, the Applicants reserve the right to rewrite claims 10-14 and 26-30 at a later time.

Claims 2 and 18 were objected to for containing typographical errors. The Applicants have amended claims 2 and 18 to correct these errors as noted above. As such, the objection of claims 2 and 18 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,349,336 B1 to *Sit et al.* (hereinafter "*Sit*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Prior to addressing the rejection, the Applicants provide herewith a brief summary of the present invention. The present invention provides a method and system for providing a computer running a Web browser with HTTP access to a peer server located behind a firewall in a peer-to-peer network. Particularly, a peer server multiplexes Web traffic between a firewall-protected peer server and a peer server which is not protected by the firewall. According to the present invention, in response to a proxy server receiving an HTTP request to access the peer server located behind the firewall from the web browser, the HTTP request is translated into a request packet and the request packet is sent to the peer server. In response to the peer server behind the firewall receiving the request packet, the peer server translates the request packet back into the HTTP request and then responds to the request, thereby enabling generic web traffic to flow. The Applicants submit that *Sit* does not disclose the features of translating a HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to a peer server.

Now turning to the rejection, according to Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicants submit that *Sit* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-4 and 17-20.

More specifically, claim 1 recites a method for providing a Web browser running on a computer with access to a peer server located behind a firewall comprising, among other features, in response to a proxy server receiving an HTTP request to access the peer server from the Web browser, “translating the HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to the peer server.” Claim 17 includes similar features. The Applicants submit that *Sit* does not disclose translating a HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to a peer server which is located behind a firewall. In maintaining the rejection, the Patent Office asserts that *Sit* discloses this feature at col. 7, ll. 50-60. (See Office Action, page 3). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Sit discloses fooling a firewall in order to pass data to a browser which is behind the firewall. More specifically, *Sit* discloses wrapping a request sent from a browser 314E to a web server 308I, which is behind a firewall 305, such that, to the firewall 305, the request appears as a response from the browser 314E to a request sent by the web server 308I. (See *Sit*, col. 7, ll. 50-57). As is well known, wrapping includes a header which precedes encapsulated data and a trailer which follows the encapsulated data such that the encapsulated data is not viewable to a firewall. Wrapping does not involve translating a HTTP request into a request packet. In fact, the teachings of *Sit* teach away from the present invention in that *Sit* discloses fooling a firewall into allowing the transmission of a packet by altering header information such that the packet appears as something it is not, i.e., instead of being a request, the packet appears as a response. Accordingly, claims 1 and 17 are patentable over *Sit* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-4, and 18-20, which respectively depend from claims 1 and 17, are patentable for at least the same reasons along with the novel features recited therein.

Claims 5-7, 15, 16, 21-23, and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sit*. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. According to Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants submit that *Sit* does not disclose all the features recited in claims 5-7, 15, 16, 21-23, and 31-34. As detailed above, *Sit* does not disclose all the features recited in claims 1 and 17, the base claims from which claims 5-7, 15, 16, 21-23, 31, and 32 respectively depend. Therefore, these claims are patentable over *Sit* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 33 recites a method for providing a web browser comprising, among other

features, in response to a proxy server receiving a redirected HTTP request, “translating the HTTP requests into a multiplexed protocol comprising a request packet, and sending the request packet to the peer server” and in response to a peer node receiving an HTTP response from the Web server, “translating the HTTP response into a response packet, and sending the response packet to the proxy server.” Claim 34 includes similar features. As detailed above, *Sit* does not disclose translating a HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to a peer server which is located behind a firewall. Similarly, *Sit* does not disclose translating a HTTP packet into a response packet and sending the response packet to a proxy server. As such, claims 33 and 34 are patentable over *Sit* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sit* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,917,965 B2 to *Gupta et al.* (hereinafter “*Gupta*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The Applicants submit that neither *Sit* nor *Gupta*, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all the features recited in claims 8, 9, 24, and 25. As detailed above, *Sit* does not disclose all the features recited in claims 1 and 17, the base claims from which claims 8, 9, 24, and 25 respectively depend. Moreover, *Gupta* does not overcome the previously noted shortcomings of *Sit*. Therefore, claims 8, 9, 24, and 25 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The present application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants’ representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:



Anthony J. Josephson
Registration No. 45,742
100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: December 17, 2007
Attorney Docket: 1104-062